UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			10 0 St 10 1
OAKLAND DIVISION			
United States of America,	)	Case No. CR	11-01290W 2011
Plaintiff, v.	) ) )		ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
Kevin Dandiefranklin,	)		
Defendant.	: j		
or the reasons stated by the parties on the record on October 24, 2011, the Court excludes time under the peedy Trial Act from October 24, 2011 to November 6, 2011 and finds that the ends of justice served y the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):			
Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).			
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).			
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED: 10/24/11		LAUREL BEEL United States M	LER fagistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defe	ndant	BSWWS Assistant Unite	7N_ d States Attorney